

REMARKS

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner has objected to Claims 4 and 5 due to the following informality in line 1 of each claim; “copying at least a portion” should be changed to “copying the at least a portion. Applicant has amended Claims 4 and 5 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended Claim 5 to more particularly point out and clarify the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 6-8, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,210,749 issued to Firoozmand (“Firoozmand”). Applicant traverses the rejection. Firoozmand discloses demarking and classifying packets of data in transmit and receive buffers using tag and status bits at the end of the last word of each packet. The tag and status bits are used to determine the amount of data in the buffers and when to transfer data into or out of a buffer. Nothing in Firoozmand discloses copying from one buffer to another based on the first and second conditions as

recited in the claims. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended the claims to more particularly point out and clarify the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Applicant has amended the first and second preconditions recited in the claims to read the EDMA and DMA preconditions respectively. Nothing in Firoozmand discloses EDMA and DMA preconditions as described and claimed in the present application. Accordingly, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, 6-8, 17, 19 and 20.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Firoozmand in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,099,328 issued to Galbi et al. (“Galbi”). Claims 7 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Firoozmand in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,012,926 issued to Weng et al. (“Weng”). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Firoozmand in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,888,830 issued to Snyder II et al. (“Snyder”). Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Firoozmand in view of Weng and in further view of Galbi. Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Firoozmand in view of Fred Halsall’s *Data Communications, Computer Networks and Open Systems*. Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Firoozmand in view of Fred Halsall and further in view of Weng. Applicant traverses the rejections.

With reference to Claims 3, 7, 9 and 18, the Galbi, Weng, and Snyder references do not cure the deficiencies of Firoozmand as explained with reference to independent

claims 1 and 17 above. Applicant submits, therefore, that they are allowable, at least in part, because they depend from allowable independent Claims 1 and 17, and because of their additional limitations.

With reference to the rejection of Claims 10-16 and 21-23, the Examiner again relies on the same passages in Firoozmand that were cited against Claims 1-2, 4-5, 6-8, 17, 19 and 20. Applicant reiterates their position that the disclosure of Firoozmand does not disclose copying packet data from one buffer to another based on the first and second conditions as recited in the claims as originally filed, much less the EDMA and DMA preconditions as described and claimed in the claims as currently amended. The cited disclosure in the Galbi, Weng, and Halsall references do not cure the deficiencies of Firoozmand with respect to Claims 10-16 and 21-23. Accordingly, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 3, 7, 9-16, 18 and 21-23.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, Claims 1-23 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: November 16, 2007

/Donna Jo Coningsby/
Donna Jo Coningsby
Reg. No. 41,684
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778